REMARKS

Examiner Owens is again thanked for his thorough evaluation of the present application. Independent Claim 19, has now been amended to more clearly describe applicant's unique structure and in so doing become distinguishable from Examiner's cited prior art.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 19 - 21,under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al (US 6,407,420),in view of Fukase (US 5,656,529), Claim 19 has again been amended to describe a capacitor structure in which agglomerated metal silicide is located **only** on all exposed surfaces of a cylindrical storage node wherein the cylindrical storage node is comprised of a cylindrical polysilicon shape. Amended independent Claim 19, as well as Figs. 9 - 10, now clearly describe and show agglomerated metal silicide **only** on exposed surfaces of the cylindrical polysilicon shape. In contrast Yamanaka et al only teach a cylindrical polysilicon shape with vertical polysilicon shapes adjacent to a horizontal, bottom polysilicon shape, however without overlying agglomerated metal silicide, while Fukase only teaches an agglomerated metal silicide layer on a top surface of a non-cylindrical polysilicon shape. Again applicant's structure describes an agglomerated metal silicide layer on all exposed surfaces of the underlying cylindrical polysilicon shape, including the agglomerated

metal silicide layer on all sides of, and on top surfaces of the vertical features of the polysilicon shape, as well as on the exposed bottom surface of the bottom of the same underlying polysilicon shape. Again in contrast to the Fukase prior art which only shows a thick block of polycrystalline tungsten silicide only on the top surface of a block of polycrystalline silicon, without the desirable feature of being present on the sides of the same block polycrystalline silicon, certainly not applicants unique structure in which an agglomerated layer is located on all surfaces of a cylindricral shaped structure. In addition applicant only desires, and therefore emphatically describes, agglomerated metal silicide only on all surfaces of the cylindrical structure, not present on any other surface of the device. This very attractive feature of agglomerated material located only on all surfaces of a cylindrical structure, (allowing the maximum of surface area of agglomerated metal silicide), is not an easy feature to form via simple process sequences, thus the presence of such a structure is not seen in prior art. One would have to employ a specific process sequence to obtain applicant's structure,(agglomerated metal silicide on all exposed vertical and horizontal features of a cylindrical polysilicon storage node **without** the presence of the same agglomerated metal silicide on non-polysilicon surfaces), therefore applicant's structure remains unique. Surely if one's objective is to increase surface area applicant's structure would

be the ultimate example. Since applicant's structure remains unique, (agglomerated metal silicide **only located on** all surfaces of a cylindrically shaped underlying polysilicon structure and **not** located on any other surface), the combination of the Yamanaka et al, in view of the Fukase prior art do not lead to applicants structure, and thus applicant's structure is not an obvious consequence of these prior art. The fact that neither prior art with the same objective as applicant, or subsequent prior art with the privilege of seeing the Yamanaka, and Fukase prior art, arrived at applicant's desirable and unique structure, shows that applicant's unique structure was, or is not obvious via a combination of the prior arts. Again none of the prior art shows agglomerated metal silicide **only** on all vertical and horizontal features of a cylindrical polysilicon structure.

Dependent Claim 21, has also been amended for consistency with now amended independent Claim 19, while dependent Claim 20, has been cancelled without prejudice.

Therefore it is felt that applicant's structure, now described in amended independent Claim 19, is novel and unique, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. Applicants use of a combination of features such as: a storage node structure comprised of an cylindrical polysilicon shape featuring uniformly doped vertical shapes completely covered by an agglomerated metal silicide layer **located only** on all exposed vertical and

horizontal features of the cylindrical polysilicon shape, is clearly distinguishable, and novel, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. No combination of the prior art can claim applicant's unique structure. The feature of locating agglomerated metal silicide only on exposed surfaces of the cylindrical polysilicon shape and not on any other surface, is not easily obtainable and therefore not previously described in prior art. Therefore it is strongly felt that no combination of prior arts can be used to describe applicants structure. Applicant has claimed his process in detail. The structure described in Figs. 1 - 10, and in Claims 19 and 21, are both believed to be novel and patentable over these various references, because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that the combination of claimed elements would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. We therefore request Examiner Owens to reconsider his rejections of independent Claim 19, and of dependent Claim 21, referencing amended independent Claim 19, in view of these arguments.

Allowance of all claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Owens not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned attorney at 845-452-5863, to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg # 37,761